

and it creates enormous returns on investment in jobs, diplomatic influence, and engagement.

Meanwhile, other countries are positioning themselves to be there for the coming African economic boom—countries like Brazil, India, and you guessed it, China. China has aggressively moved in. In fact, today, China is Africa's largest trading partner. China has pumped billions of dollars into Africa, often in the form of concessional loans—loans below market rates that have favorable payback options. These loans are hard to resist for developing countries, and they're hard for American companies to compete with.

Between 2008 and 2010, China provided more financing to the developing world than the World Bank—loans totaling more than \$110 billion. This money buys China access to markets, natural resources, consumers, and political influence. A recent story on CNN.com, entitled "Chinese Media Make Inroads into Africa," shows the kind of aggressive engagement we are up against.

This past January, state-owned Chinese Central Television opened its first broadcast hub outside of Beijing. Where did they put it? Mumbai? London? Rio? Try Nairobi. Another Chinese state-run news organization has more than 20 bureaus on the African continent, part of what is called the China Africa News Service. According to the article, it's all part of an effort "to win the hearts and minds of people in the continent and create a more fertile business environment." And it's at our expense. It should make us take a hard look at what the U.S. Government is doing to promote and support our own businesses. And that is what this bill does.

But this bill is not just good for American interests, it is also good for Africa—something our competitors are not always concerned with. While the Chinese may offer sweetheart deals that buyers can't resist, the price of doing business with China is much higher than just the cost of repaying loans.

To calculate the real price you have to add to the sum the precious natural resources that China gobbles up for its growing economy back home and the environmental devastation that comes from its general lack of concern for environmental standards. You have to add the cost of Africans losing out on work when the Chinese ship in their own labor to build the projects they are bankrolling. And when Africans do get the jobs you have to consider the cost of the poor labor standards and working conditions they have to endure. And lastly you have to consider China's indifference to democracy, corruption, and human rights standards.

A recent New York Times article illustrated an even greater cost—a far more deadly side of Chinese involvement in Africa. It dealt with the resurgence of ivory poaching in Uganda and Kenya and the DRC. It is a resurgence that has resulted in tens of thousands

of elephants being slaughtered over the past several years and, get this, it is a resurgence fueled by Chinese demand—as much as 70 percent of the ivory is smuggled to China. In fact, the article goes on to say that there is growing evidence that ivory poaching actually increases in elephant-rich areas where Chinese construction workers are building roads.

Now, I said this was a deadly consequence of Chinese involvement in Africa, but I didn't mean just for elephants. Much of the money from this Chinese-fueled increase in the ivory trade ends up in the hands of international fugitive Joseph Kony and his band of murdering thugs. It is widely believed that Kony's Lord's Resistance Army has embraced ivory poaching to fund its reign of terror.

The U.S. Government should seek a level of engagement with our African partners that makes American companies and American products competitive alternatives to what China has to offer. That's what this bill does. It would establish a minimum number of commercial Foreign Service officers to be stationed at U.S. embassies in Africa and the multi-lateral investment banks. It would increase the Export Import Bank staff presence on the ground in Africa. That means better support for U.S. businesses on the continent and better interface with African governments. The bill would also formalize the training economic and commercial officers receive, so they are fully aware of all the tools available for export promotion and financing—a benefit to businesses who want to do business in Africa, or anywhere in the world. And finally, it would equip the U.S. government to counter the aggressive concessional—or below market—loans that many African nations cannot resist.

The Increasing American Jobs through Greater Exports to Africa Act has something for everyone to support. It is good for the American economy. It helps U.S. businesses create jobs here at home by tapping into a burgeoning overseas market hungry for our products. It is good U.S. foreign policy. It positions America to maintain our global leadership in a shifting geopolitical landscape. And it is good for the people of the African continent. Superior American products and business practices would become more competitive and financially accessible to them.

That is why the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved this common sense bill. Now the full Senate has a chance to do the same. I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical effort. We must commit today that the United States will not be left behind in Africa. Every day we wait, countries such as China expand their economic, political, and diplomatic footprint on the continent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

WIND ENERGY TAX CREDIT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to urge my colleagues to extend the production tax credit for wind energy. I would like to note that on the heels of Senator DURBIN's comments about China, we wish the Chinese energy industry well, but we do not want to outsource our wind energy jobs to China needlessly. We are on a path to do so.

I see my colleague from Iowa here, Senator GRASSLEY, who I know will speak later on the wind production tax credit, but it is going to expire in less than 1 month from now—December 31, to be specific—if we do not act. That means we are 1 month away from pulling the rug out from under an industry that is currently playing a key role in revitalizing American manufacturing, creating jobs, and powering our Nation. We are literally 1 month away from ending a credit that supports tens of thousands of workers right here in the United States.

Each day that we wait to extend the PTC, we risk losing more good-paying American jobs. We also risk doing away with a credit that is a major contributor to the success and development of our Nation's wind industry. This credit has helped companies leverage billions of dollars' worth of investments and created thousands of made-in-America manufacturing jobs.

If history is any guide, allowing this critical tax credit to expire would be disastrous. The expiration of the PTC in 2000, 2002, and 2004 led to massive drops in wind energy installation. Already in my home State of Colorado this year we have seen hundreds of layoffs across the Front Range due to our heel-dragging on the PTC.

Each time I discuss the PTC on the Senate floor, I highlight a different State to show the vitality of the wind industry in that particular State, how this important credit has created jobs for that State's economy. Today I am here to talk about Iowa, America's heartland and the homeland of the PTC.

In Iowa wind power is no longer an alternative source of energy. In fact, Iowa has become the Nation's No. 2 producer of wind energy, providing close to 20 percent of the State's electric power. Its potential is not even close to being fully tapped. Iowa's wind resources could someday produce up to 44 times the State's current electricity needs.

Let me share some specifics with my colleagues. Nearly 3,000 turbines spin statewide in Iowa, and Iowa is home to various manufacturing facilities that produce wind turbines and components. The industry employs nearly 7,000 Iowans, half of whom are located at manufacturing facilities all across the State.

Take, for example, Pocahontas County. We can see the map of Iowa here. There are a total of 216 wind turbines that have been constructed in Pocahontas County. When all turbines are

at full taxable value, they will contribute an estimated total of almost \$190 million to the total county tax base. This means additional revenue for local budgets and additional money for investments in schools and critical community projects.

Iowans know the possibilities and potential a continued investment in wind energy holds for their future. However, I wish to underline again that if we do not act, good-paying jobs will continue to be lost and an industry that is critical to our energy independence will be hit very hard.

This is simply unacceptable. Already Siemens Energy is laying off 615 workers in three States, including Iowa. The company Siemens has acknowledged that difficult market conditions are due to congressional inaction on the PTC.

My colleagues from Iowa, Senators GRASSLEY and HARKIN, have been standing with me to fight for the renewal of the production tax credit. Senator GRASSLEY is known as the father of the wind production tax credit. He led the charge some 20 years ago to establish this credit, and I applaud him and Senator HARKIN for their work in the renewable energy sector and their dedication to extending this important credit. They know the PTC is a win for Iowa and a win for the United States. That is why it is so important—beyond important—to extend the PTC as soon as possible. The PTC equals jobs, and we ought to pass it as soon as possible.

As my colleagues keep telling me and we hear from the American people, there is no reason to outsource these jobs. There is no reason to outsource energy production, and there is no reason to damage a growing industry that is helping America become energy independent. Congress needs to pass an extension of the production tax credit today. We can't wait any longer.

Let's create jobs and build the clean energy economy of the future. Let's extend the wind production tax credit and let's do it now. It is that simple. The production tax credit equals jobs. Let's pass it ASAP.

Again, I wish to acknowledge my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, who has been a leader in this important policy area for the last 20 years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, I had an opportunity to hear what Senator UDALL of Colorado had to say about Iowa and my participation, and I thank him very much for his kind remarks.

This year Senator MARK UDALL is the champion of people speaking about the wind energy tax credit. I have spoken a few times, but he has spoken for every State that has a wind energy business. He has spoken many times more than I have, and I wish to compliment Senator UDALL from Colorado for doing that.

I think it is a foregone conclusion that after 20 years' of investment of taxpayer money in what we call the tax incentive for wind energy, and with the industry just about becoming a mature industry—and there are different points of view within the industry, but in just a few years it will be starting to phase out—this wind energy tax credit can go away because it will be a mature industry much as the ethanol tax credit went away at the end of last year. So with this tremendous investment, it seems to me it would be a shame not to continue it so we can get to maturity, and then in a sense ratify the decision of the good investment of taxpayer money that has already been made.

So today it is my privilege to join my colleague, Senator UDALL of Colorado, on the floor of the Senate to discuss the importance of wind energy and the need to extend the production tax credit for wind. I appreciate Senator UDALL's commitment to the production tax credit for wind energy. As I have said before, but I wish to say it again, he has come to the floor many times during the past several months to highlight the importance of wind energy in the various States. He has been a real leader on this issue.

As Senator UDALL has said, I have been a longtime supporter of the wind energy tax credit beginning with my authorship of the first wind production tax credit in 1992. At the time, I have to confess I didn't see coming, for my State or for the Nation as a whole, the big deal it has become not only in the production of wind energy and Iowa being No. 2 in the Nation, but also the component manufacturing that goes on in most every State involved in wind energy, including my own State. Particularly, I didn't foresee, at a time when most of our talk about exporting jobs is actually exporting jobs, and in my State, at least from two countries, Spain and Germany, we have been able to import jobs—or I should say import the ability to create jobs through foreign investment—for the component manufacturing. So it has been a success in so many ways.

Maybe one other point that ought to be emphasized at this time: Some Members—and maybe more Members in the other body—seem to be more cynical about any sort of investment in green energy because of Solyndra and other places where taxpayer money has gone in the way of grants and then there has been immediate bankruptcy, resulting in a waste of taxpayer money. There is absolutely no benefit from the wind energy tax credit unless energy is actually produced. So it is

not going to be one of those situations where through taxpayer money, through a tax incentive, money is going to some company and not reaping the benefits of it, the end result in this case being the production of wind energy.

The production tax credit for wind is working and should be a part of the effort in Washington to get more Americans working. Nationally, the wind energy industry supports 75,000 jobs. There are more than 400 manufacturing facilities nationwide supplying wind components. Thirty-five percent of all new electricity generation added during the last 5 years was from wind, and this happens to be more than from coal and nuclear combined. Today, 60 percent of a wind turbine's value is produced in the United States, compared with just 25 percent in the year 2005.

As I have said so often, my home State of Iowa is a leader in wind energy production and component manufacturing. Nearly 20 percent of Iowa's electricity needs are met from wind energy, powering the equivalent of 1 million homes. Almost 3,000 utility-scale turbines in Iowa generate lease payments to landowners, worth \$14 million every year. Iowa is behind only Texas nationally in terms of installed wind capacity. The wind energy employs more than 6,000 Iowans. These jobs are at risk because Congress has so far failed to extend the production tax credit which is set to expire at the end of the year.

In fact, hundreds of Iowans employed in wind energy have already been laid off because of slowing demand over uncertainty of tax credits, and there will be more laid off in my State except in one city where they are manufacturing components to go to Canada for use in wind energy in Canada. Certainty about tax policy and affordable energy, then, are factors for economic growth and getting unemployed workers back on the assembly line.

As much energy as possible—both traditional and renewable—should be produced at home to create jobs and strengthen national security. Wind energy is obviously a free resource, and it is abundant in many places around the country. I suppose we could say wind is abundant every place, but at speeds that make the production of energy from wind cost-effective.

In my State, most of these facilities are in northwest Iowa where the wind averages about 14 miles per hour compared to going diagonally down to the southeast corner of the State where it averages about 8 miles per hour. So if there is enough constant wind, this is very definitely a free resource.

Wind is also a homegrown resource. The electricity it generates is produced on local farms for local customers and often adds investment value to the community. A clean, renewable source such as wind is not dependent on far-away countries with leaders, in the case of petroleum, for instance, who happen to be so hostile to the United

States even as they take our energy dollars and maybe use those against us. That is why there is broad support for extending this worthwhile policy.

Legislation in the House of Representatives to extend the production tax credit has 119 cosponsors, including 25 Republicans. In August the Senate Finance Committee, with a bipartisan vote, passed my extension of the wind energy production tax credit amendment I offered at that particular time.

The Governors' Wind Energy Coalition and the Western Governors' Association have called for an extension of the production tax credit. The Western Governors' Association is an independent organization representing Governors of 19 States, and current membership includes 13 Republicans and 6 Democratic Governors. So there is pretty broad bipartisan consensus among Governors that this ought to be extended.

I was pleased to join a press conference a few weeks ago with Senator MARK UDALL and over 40 military veterans representing Operation Free. They were visiting Capitol Hill to meet with Members of Congress, encouraging Congress to extend the wind production tax credit.

The wind energy production tax credit was created to try to level the playing field with coal-fired and nuclear electricity generation. The production tax credit for wind is available only when wind energy is produced. There is no benefit for simply placing the turbine in the ground. It is a tax relief that rewards results, and that is much different than failed taxpayer-funded grants and loans made since 2009 when a lot of that money went to companies that are now bankrupt.

Those who want to do away with the wind energy tax incentive don't seem to mention that other forms of energy have received far more generous tax incentives for many decades longer than the wind energy industry. Oil and gas and nuclear power all received longstanding Federal support. I wish to emphasize, because I believe I read somewhere, that one of the opponents of the wind energy tax credit being extended comes from nuclear.

Do my colleagues think we would even have a nuclear industry in the United States since the 1950s or 1960s if it weren't for the Price Anderson Act that supports it as kind of a super—or an insurer of last resort? It would never have developed, and it is still in existence. Isn't it a little bit intellectually dishonest to say that wind should not have the tax incentive when other industries wouldn't even exist if they hadn't had it already?

If we are going to have a discussion of which industries merit Federal support and which industries don't, the discussion needs to be intellectually honest. If we are having that discussion, everything needs to be on the table, not just wind energy. Can you think of 60 extenders that are going to sunset at the end of this year? Only

one—wind—seems to be attacked right now.

This extension deserves a place in our year-end package of tax extenders to help give confidence investors want and employers need to keep and hire workers.

There is no reason to exacerbate the unemployment problem by failing to extend this successful incentive. America's security in the short- and long-term depends on a robust effort to develop domestic energy sources.

Before I leave the floor, this can be done by the extender bill all by itself being passed or it can be, as we hope, that President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER have some sort of framework for us to put meat on that framework so we do not go over the cliff and have this bill be a part of it. When that whole fiscal cliff debate is about jobs, we do not want to forget about these 75,000 jobs that are in wind energy. A lot of these jobs have already led to some layoffs. We could bring those people back to work pretty fast.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RULES CHANGES

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, the Founders of this great country clearly wanted the Senate to serve as a deliberative body anchored with the ability to fully amend and to fully debate issues. Yet there has been a lot of talk lately about Senate rules changes to limit Senators' ability to make their voices heard.

To many, this may sound like inside baseball, limited to the concerns of just a handful of Senators. But let me assure you this issue is so much more than that. The changes that are being contemplated would significantly impact everyday Americans, especially those who live in rural or less-populated States.

Take Nebraska, for example. We do not necessarily consider ourselves small. We have almost 2 million people and several Fortune 500 companies. But we also do not like the idea of getting steamrolled by high-population States; for example, California, New York or Illinois. But that is exactly what these Senate rules changes would allow.

This is not just some wild supposition on my part. The majority leader himself said the filibuster "is a unique privilege that serves to aid small States from being trampled by the desires of larger states." He went on to say it is "one of the most sacred rules of the Senate."

Of course, that was a few years ago, before he proposed to do the very thing

he has criticized. He now appears ready to undermine the most important rule, not by a two-thirds vote, as clearly required by Senate rule XXII, but by a simple majority fiat. This contradicts longstanding practice and disregards the 67-vote threshold President Lyndon Baines Johnson said "preserves, indisputably, the character of the Senate."

This is the same so-called nuclear option Democrats previously decried as breaking the rules to change the rules. For example, the senior Senator from New York previously opposed such a blatant power grab saying:

The checks and balances that Americans prize are at stake. The idea of bipartisanship, where you have to come together and can't just ram everything through because you have a simple majority, is at stake. The very things we treasure and love about this grand republic are at stake.

Those are pretty powerful and unequivocal words, but it does not stop there.

The senior Senator from Illinois called it "... attacking the very force within the Senate that creates compromise and bipartisanship." So that reflects a trifecta of the Democratic leadership saying it is a bad idea. Yet they keep pushing it like it has somehow magically been transformed into a good idea.

But it does not matter how long we polish the tin cup; it will not magically become the golden chalice. Again, you do not have to believe me. One of the Senate's great historians, Democratic Senator Byrd of West Virginia, was very clear on this issue. He said: "Our Founding Fathers intended the Senate to be a continuing body that allows for open and unlimited debate and the protection of minority rights."

When faced with the idea of limiting these basic underpinnings of the Senate, he concluded: "We must never, ever, tear down the only wall—the necessary fence—this nation has against the excesses of the Executive Branch and the resultant haste and tyranny of the majority."

I had the great privilege of working with Senator Byrd when I first came to the Senate. We offered an amendment together which would have prevented the majority from stretching the Senate rules to enact Draconian cap-and-trade legislation on a simple majority vote—interestingly enough, a situation not so different from today's proposals.

Senator Byrd was very wise in these matters, serving as his party's leader in both times of majority and minority. He had seen both sides of the fence, if you will. He had studied the Framers and had determined that such a blatant power grab could not stand. In fact, the vast majority of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, agreed and our amendment passed on a vote of 67 to 31. That is exactly what should happen. If changes are needed, a bipartisan supermajority should approve them, not a simple majority changing the rules to break the rules, not a simple majority steamrolling the Nation.